

Application S/N 10/786,945  
Amendment Dated: August 31, 2005  
Response to Office Action dated: June 6, 2005

CE12442JME

### REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-20 remain pending in the application. In the Office Action, claim 2 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, for insufficient antecedent basis for the limitation "the wearable electronic product." In response, Applicants have amended claim 2. In addition, claims 1, 2, 4, 7-10, 14 and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,797,102 to Hallikainen, et al. (Hallikainen). Finally, claims 3, 5, 6, 11-13 and 16-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hallikainen in view of U.S. Published Patent Application No. 2002/0132585 to Palermo, et al. (Palermo). It is believed that claims 9 and 10 are not subject to the 103(a) rejection, even though these claims are listed in the first sentence of paragraph 8 on page 5 of the Office Action, because no explanation is presented in the text that follows paragraph 8 as to why these claims are obvious in view of the combination of Hallikainen and Palermo.

A brief summary of the Hallikainen reference may be helpful here. Hallikainen discloses an arrangement for adapting the signal level in mobile phones according to the related auxiliary device connected to the mobile phone. The microprocessor of the mobile phone receives the connection data from the auxiliary device when the auxiliary device is connected to the mobile phone. In addition, the microprocessor comprises a memory in which the amplification data respectively required has been stored depending on the type of the auxiliary device. The microprocessor then transmits the appropriate amplification data to the PCM-codec of the mobile phone and to its digital signal processor (see the Abstract). As such, Hallikainen is concerned merely with

Application S/N 10/788,945  
Amendment Dated: August 31, 2005  
Response to Office Action dated: June 8, 2005

CE12442JME

adapting audio signal levels in auxiliary devices, not their independent activation and operation.

Independent claims 1, 9 and 10 have been amended to clarify that the peripheral device that selectively couples and decouples to the electronic host device activates independently of the electronic host device when decoupled from the electronic host device. Independent claim 16 already includes such a limitation in view of the "in response to detecting the selective decoupling" element in the claim. These claims also include the limitation that the peripheral device further activates and operates independently of other peripheral devices that selectively couple and decouple to the electronic host device.

Hallikainen (and Palermo, for that matter) simply does not disclose in any way the concept of a peripheral device activating in response to being decoupled from a host device where the peripheral device also activates and operates independently of other peripheral devices that selectively couple and decouple to the electronic host device. To be able to perform such a task, the peripheral device requires its own portable power supply, like a rechargeable battery. Hallikainen never discusses this topic. Moreover, if one assumes that the Examiner is correct in noting, in his rejection of claim 10, that the peripheral device has a power source in order to work (see page 4 of the Office Action), such a power source would be a AC-powered wall outlet for some of the examples of auxiliary devices that Hallikainen recites: a hand-held telephone, a data modem or a telefax device. In view of this type of power source, there would be no reason for the peripheral to activate upon decoupling.

Application S/N 10/786,945  
Amendment Dated: August 31, 2005  
Response to Office Action dated: June 6, 2005

CE12442JME

In view of the above, Applicants believe that independent claims 1, 9, 10 and 16 are patentable over the prior art. Applicants also believe that those claims that depend from independent claims 1, 9, 10 and 16 are patentable, both based on their dependencies on the independent claims and their patentability on their own. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of the claims is respectfully requested. Passing of this case is now believed to be in order, and a Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

No amendment made was related to the statutory requirements of patentability unless expressly stated herein. No amendment made was for the purpose of narrowing the scope of any claim, unless Applicants have argued herein that such amendment was made to distinguish over a particular reference or combination of references.

In the event that the Examiner deems the present application non-allowable, it is requested that the Examiner telephone the Applicants' attorney or agent at the number indicated below so that the prosecution of the present case may be advanced by the clarification of any continuing rejection.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any necessary fee, or credit any overpayment, to Motorola, Inc. Deposit Account No. 50-2117.

**SEND CORRESPONDENCE TO:**

Motorola, Inc.  
Law Department – MD 1610  
8000 W. Sunrise Blvd.  
Plantation, FL 33322

Customer Number: 24273

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

Larry G. Brown  
Attorney of Record  
Reg. No.: 45,834

Telephone: (954) 723-4295  
Fax No.: (954) 723-3871